

# AMERICAN KEY TO CANADA

*Marcin Gabryś*

---

*The Americans are our best friends whether we like it or not*

Robert Thompson, the Social Credit Party

I would like to present some selected problems of U.S.-Canada relations and demonstrate how important they are in order to understand Canada, its policies and Canadian complexes. In order to understand Canada, one of the options is to contrast its actions with those of the United States. I have mostly relied on materials available in Poland or on the Internet. At the beginning it is worth noting that the problem of U.S.-Canada relations is widely discussed in literature. This literature is mostly Canadian, since this problem is generally ignored by American researchers while Canadians are almost obsessively interested in this topic. Americans believe that their relations with Canada form only part of their foreign policy and that this problem arises only at times of important events (e.g. World War II, integration of North American economies, signing of the NAFTA treaty). On the other hand, in Canada this issue is regarded as a separate problem. In their book entitled *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies*, J. H. Thompson and S. J. Randall clearly suggest that it is one of the effects of the imbalance that exists between the two states.

"The asymmetry in the bilateral relationship is reflected in a number of ways, among them the imbalance between the relative attention Canadian and American scholars give to the relationship. An observer of the professional literature in history or political science would be struck by the prodigious industry of Canadian scholars who specialize in the study of what they call 'Canadian-American relations', and by the prevailing neglect on the American side."<sup>1</sup>

## THE ROAD THAT WAS NOT TAKEN BY AMERICANS

Both Canadian and American authors stress that the key to understanding Canada is the United States.<sup>2</sup> The rebellion of 13 colonies and the establishment of the United

---

<sup>1</sup> J.H. Thompson, S.J. Randall, *Canada and the United States. Ambivalent Allies*, Athens, Georgia and London: The University of Georgia Press 1994, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, *America Lite: Is That Our Future?*, "Maclean's", 25/11/2002,

States gave birth to the common border. It was the first boundary delineating the territory that is occupied by contemporary independent Canada. When the United States was established as a country, a question arose about both political and cultural borders. This was the first step in developing a separate Canadian identity. Since 1783 the policies, first of British North America, and later of the Canadian Dominion, have seemed like a wave, either approaching and tightening, or loosening the relations with the U.S. Nonetheless, Canadian policies have always taken account of the close presence of the stronger neighbor.

Except for hockey, the influence of Canada is practically unnoticeable in the United States.<sup>3</sup> Americans traveling to Canada may not even notice that they have left their country. Except in Quebec, the language is practically the same as in the U.S. People in the streets look the same and wear similar clothes. Canadian towns are perhaps a bit cleaner. Cable television channels broadcast the same programs, and most popular are those produced in the larger of the two neighbors. Shelves with magazines, periodicals or books are filled with nearly the same titles. Cinemas show the same movies, and their facades are covered with almost identical advertising boards.

However, the similarity between both states may seem illusory, especially as far politics is concerned. The governmental systems are not as similar as customs and lifestyles. Canada and the U.S. chose different road of political development. If the term "road" were used as the metaphor for a state's development, the American War of Independence would be a crossroads. The United States chose one of the options. Canada was left with the other one – the road that was not taken by the U.S. According to the authors of the aforementioned book *Canada and The United States. Ambivalent Allies*, the Paris Treaty, which ended the American Revolution, possessed an ideological dimension that had an important impact on Canada. It led the northern colonies along a different path of development.<sup>4</sup> This fact is fundamental in understanding the contemporary differences between the two states.

The state model chosen by British colonies in the North is much less known and popular than models employed on the American continents. For the United States, this model may seem to be "the road that we did not take". It was originally a transplant of the British system, but gradually evolved as a result of significant transformations over time. Owing to these changes, it was adjusted to different climate and social conditions as well as material difficulties faced by the northern colonies. It seems that the difference in political cultures in both countries was a factor that stimulated conflicts between the two states in the past. Even now this difference sometimes results in disagreement between the neighbors. A good example is the unsuccessful attempt to introduce a public car insurance system in Ontario in 1990. It was supposed to be based on existing solutions from Saskatchewan and British

---

*is the thing, along with the lint, that we have found at the very centre of ourselves – the only charitable discovery in our seemingly endless search for a national identity.*

<sup>3</sup> R. Chrétien, *Canada-U.S. Relations @ 2000: A Success Story*, in: Canadian Embassy, 1999, <http://www.canadianembassy.org/ambassador/991027-en.asp>, (20 XI 2002).

<sup>4</sup> J.H. Thompson, S.J. Randall, op.cit., p. 15.

Columbia.<sup>5</sup> As a result of resistance on the part of the U.S., where car insurance is governed by free market rules only, this project could not be completed.

It is clearly visible from the birth of political cultures in the colonies that formed the United States and Canada that all later conflicts between these states resulted from different emphasis given to safety and freedom. The settlement of over 40,000 loyalists, who left the U.S. territory after 1783, certainly had a significant impact. As Jack Granatstein notes, they rather adhered to the slogan of "peace, order and good government" than to that of the Americans: "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."<sup>6</sup>

The direction taken by British colonies in North America forced them to make different choices from those of the U.S. This was affected, for instance, by the people's fear of republicanism. The purpose was to maintain the 'British character' of future Canada. In Catholic Quebec, an additional factor was voters' bias against Protestant America. Owing to the unfriendly climate, the society of future Canada was much more focused on the fight for survival in a time of consolidation. Freedom and the pursuit of happiness were less important. Before the American War of Independence, colonists living in British North America (mostly of French origin) sought support and security from London. Unlike southern colonies, which perceived the British Empire as a source of tyranny and burdensome taxes, inhabitants of the northern part of the continent did not aim their hostility towards the metropolis, but rather at their southern neighbors. Later, as American identity developed the opposition of the inhabitants of Upper and Lower Canada was growing. They did not regard their state as a 'new Eden', where a 'new Adam' could be born. "Canada elected to see itself in history, growing from European roots, and mixing old civilization with new circumstances."<sup>7</sup>

The adaptation of British conservatism to the conditions of the New World shaped the foundations the Anglo-Canadian political culture. New geographic and social conditions deprived this conservatism of class distinctions, but, according to observers, it became much "narrower and more provincial."<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, it gained a more pragmatic, productive and tolerant tint. This had a significant impact on the contact between the new government and the French-speaking population, which was much more conservative since it was still grounded in the feudal system.

As a result of such thinking, the population of the Quebec Province did not express interest in getting involved in any military action. The antipathy felt for its southern neighbor was additionally consolidated by the inflow of loyalists, who began to flee to Canada even before the end of the war. Conservatism, anti-republicanism and attachment to the British monarchy were further strengthened. This also applied to French-speaking subjects of the British crown. In the essay enti-

<sup>5</sup> R. Mathews, *Canada/U.S. Relations*, in: Canadian Foundations 1996, <http://www.ola.bc.ca/online/cf/module-4/usrel.html>, (20 XI 2002).

<sup>6</sup> J. Granatstein, *Yankee go home: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*, quoted in: D. Camp, *In Uncle Sam's Shadow*, "Maclean's", 12/16/96, Vol. 109, Issue 51, p. 74.

<sup>7</sup> R. Mathews, op.cit.

<sup>8</sup> *Canada-U.S. Relations: The Road Not Taken*, in: Hillwatch.com: The Politics and Public Policy Resource Centre, [http://www.hillwatch.com/publications/intl\\_tradecan-us.htm](http://www.hillwatch.com/publications/intl_tradecan-us.htm), (20 XI 2002).

tled *Canada-U.S. Relations: The Road Not Taken*<sup>9</sup> we can find an example of events in Montreal. In this largest city of Lower Canada, after the victory of Admiral Nelson's fleet over Napoleon in Trafalgar in 1805, French-speaking Canadians organized street manifestations celebrating the defeat of Napoleon – "the royal usurper". The author also adds: "And it was these French Canadian burghers of the task who led the public subscription to erect a sculpture in Nelson's honor."<sup>10</sup>

The author of the essay believes that some political constructions created in Canada constituted a direct reaction to the shortcomings of the American model as viewed by the populations of Upper and Lower Canada. Such tendencies had been already noticed and contributed to the fact that in British colonies in North America the first governments responsible to assemblies elected in common elections were constituted no sooner than 60–70 years after the United States. An example is the establishment of the Canada Dominion in 1867. The "Fathers of the Confederation" (George E. Cartier, John A. Macdonald, George Brown, Alexander Galt) intentionally designed such a future political system of the state to avoid traps into which their predecessors from the south had fallen. They viewed the United States as "a (...) failed society, torn apart by the slavery issue and engaged in a bloody and prolonged civil war (...) saw American society as venial, coarse, dangerous, rash, unstable and demagogic."<sup>11</sup> For this reason, the legal act that established the Canada Dominion – *The British North America Act*, which came into effect on 1 July 1867 – was only a set of ruling instruments that did not incorporate any statements concerning human nature or citizen-government relations. The set of norms and goals contained in the U.S. Constitution did not have its equivalent in Canada until the 1980s.

However, some researchers<sup>12</sup> believe that the "patriation" of the Constitution in 1982 (since then the British parliament has not approved changes in the BNA Act) and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in the same year is an example of the "Americanization" of Canada's political system. The convergence of both systems would proceed as a result of concentration on individual rights and freedoms, which goes beyond the Canadian tradition.<sup>13</sup> Granting the Supreme Court of Canada the right to examine parliamentary laws for compliance with the Charter was the decisive step. Robin Matthews treats this as a carbon copy of the American Supreme Court's decision of 1803.

An objective look at Canada's relations with the U.S. allows us to discover their ambivalence.<sup>14</sup> The history of relations with its southern neighbor gives an compelling impression that Canadians love and admires Americans and their state and at the same time hate and despise it. Matthew Mendelson, director of the Canadian Opinion Research Archives at Queen's University, believes that public opinion researchers have great problems in describing this attitude correctly.<sup>15</sup> "It's like we

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>10</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. R. Matthews.

<sup>13</sup> R. Matthews, op.cit.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. J.H. Thompson, S.J. Randall, op.cit.

<sup>15</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.

believe we can have our cake and eat it too. That we can be closer to the U.S. on issues of defence and security, have closer economic ties, but that we can still symbolically object to American policy around the world and maintain a distinct societal organization."<sup>16</sup>

In spite of the constantly intensifying integration of the economic systems, the Canadian policy sometimes aims at cooling down relations with the United States, to make them tighter later on. This sequence is repeated at irregular intervals. The first example is the severe defeat in 1911 of Prime Minister Laurier's Liberal Party and the consequent failure of the free trade treaty with the United States that had been negotiated not long before. The slogan used by Laurier's foes was very meaningful – "No Truck or Trade with the Yankees". Similar statements could be heard during the campaign for ratification of the free trade treaty – seventy one years later.

The two countries entered into close relations during World War II. The friendship of Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt resulted in establishing the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, a common advisory body in charge of defence, in 1940. The relations were cooled down by Prime Minister Diefenbaker's attempt to change trade exchange priorities. The Canadian government tried to shift the center of gravity and make Great Britain the most important trade partner, at the expense of the United States' share. This decision led to the Liberals' defeat in 1963.

## UNEQUAL PARTNERS

Examining American-Canadian relations, one cannot ignore the difference in the positioning of both states in the international arena. This situation has caused and continues to cause conflicts, since no state understands the other as much as the other believes that it should.<sup>17</sup> Given the considerable difference in the power, this agreement gets even more difficult.

In the context of the differing positions of Canada and the U.S. it is worth mentioning the reflections contained in J.F. Grandy's report entitled *A Survey of Canada-U.S. Relations*,<sup>18</sup> published in April 1951. This study was prepared at the request of the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, in response to a great change in the relations between the two states connected with the beginning of the Cold War. The bipolar international system and the United States, which had become a superpower, affected the environment in which Canada was able to pursue its foreign policy. It is obvious – the report stated – that the geographic location of Canada, in close proximity to the United States makes the country naturally susceptible to its neighbor's tremendous influence. Grandy attempted to examine at Canadian-American relations from the perspective of differences in political systems and the "national character and temperament". He wrote that Congressmen too often voted according to the interests of their own electoral district, which differed from

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>17</sup> A. Chapnic, *Inevitable Co-Dependency (And Things Best Left Unsaid): The Grandy Report on Canadian-American Relations, 1951-?*, "Canadian Foreign Policy", Vol. 9, No. 1, Fall 2001, p. 26.

<sup>18</sup> Ibidem, p. 23.

those of the United States as a whole. According to the author of the report, Americans have "a more impulsive and sometimes a more emotional approach than Canadians to the questions of foreign policy."<sup>19</sup> What's even worse – the report continued – Washington was very rarely willing to go beyond the generally adopted standards in its actions, resulting in impulsiveness, lack of awareness of consequences and sometimes even a lack of tolerance in the U.S. foreign policy.

On the other hand, American researchers concerned with American-Canadian relations stress the Canadian "double diplomacy standard."<sup>20</sup> Canadians feel justified when they criticize the U.S. But they find it difficult to come to terms with the scarce knowledge of their lifestyle and customs possessed by Americans. The same thing applies to foreign policy – Canadians view themselves as authorized to criticize the policy conducted by the United States, but demonstrate resentment when Americans reprimand their own policy. Canadian political literature on this topic often mentions the mistake made by President Ronald Reagan in November 1983.<sup>21</sup> Asked by journalists about the greatest trade partner of the United States, he responded that it was Japan. In fact, Canada is the US largest trade partner (22.4% of exports<sup>22</sup>), a fact which is often forgotten by the leaders of the country.

Canada's economic dependence on the U.S. justifies a greater interest of the Canadian society and mass media in country's relations with its powerful neighbor. 30% of Canadian GNP comes from exports, in which the United States accounts for 86%.<sup>23</sup> For the U.S., exports to Canada account for a mere 0.1% of the American GNP.<sup>24</sup> Over half of the Canadian industry is owned by American companies. As much as 68% of all foreign investment in Canada is sponsored by U.S. capital.<sup>25</sup>

The imbalance is particularly clear when attempting to assess the geopolitical situation of both countries: the United States is presently the only world superpower, whereas Canada still aspires, at the very most, to be a middle power. The neighbors are also divided by an over tenfold difference in population figures and an even greater one in economic or military power. Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Prime Minister in the period 1963–1968, wrote in his memoirs: "In one form or another, for Canada, there was always security in numbers. We did not want to be alone with our close friend and neighbour."<sup>26</sup> It seems that this quote provides a picture of the relations between the two "partners" in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The United States has always been the party with much greater power in these relations. Anna

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, p. 23.

<sup>20</sup> L.W. Aronsen, *American National Security and Relations with Canada, 1945-54*, Westport, Connecticut: Praeger 1997, p. 187, quoted in: A. Chapnic, op.cit., p. 26.

<sup>21</sup> E.E. Mahant, G.S. Mount, *An Introduction to Canadian-American Relations*, Agincourt, Ontario: Methuen Publications 1994, p. 11.

<sup>22</sup> *CIA World Factbook 2002*, 2002,  
<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/us.html#Econ>, (24 XI 2002).

<sup>23</sup> *CIA World Factbook 2002*, 2002,  
<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ca.html#Econ>, (24 XI 2002).

<sup>24</sup> *CIA World Factbook 2002*, op.cit.

<sup>25</sup> W. Dobrzycki, *System międzyamerykański*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Scholar 2002, p. 308.

<sup>26</sup> J.L. Granatstein, ed., *Canadian Foreign Policy: historical readings*, Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman 1993, p. 10.

Reczyńska accurately noted that "(...) mutual relations between Canada and the United States have been proper for a long time now, but they have never been called equal, but special."<sup>27</sup>

## AMERICAN CANADA

Some bias against the society, policies and the growing influence of the southern neighbor could still be noticed in the mid-1970s and early 1980s. According to some political observers, this bias reached its peak at that time. This was associated among other things, with the Vietnam War, the Watergate scandal and the fuel crisis, which was met with a particularly negative reception in Canada – a major exporter of energy products. In addition, this sector of the economy was strongly dominated by American companies. As a response, in 1973 Pierre Trudeau's government established the Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA), which was responsible for monitoring foreign capital in Canada. A similar goal – self-sufficiency in energy production – was shared by the National Energy Program (NEP), launched in 1980. Both projects enjoyed the support of over 80%.<sup>28</sup> Nonetheless, these actions were abandoned, as a direct result of the United States' critical opinion of them.<sup>29</sup>

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, some questions of how Canada should behave within the new situation began to arise. Very close relations with the U.S., which seemed necessary when peace was threatened, suddenly appeared as chains restricting Canada's freedom. They exposed the Canadian economy to direct threats, causing it to suffer from almost every crisis that struck its southern neighbor. The last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the early 21<sup>st</sup> century have intensified integration tendencies in the world, a fact that is proven by the example of the European Union. Globalization has forced Canada to resign from many national programs. Like any other state, Canada had to agree to adopt the rules of the free market, which became the only reliable economic system after the collapse of communism. Brian Mulroney's government signed the Free Trade Agreement (1988). The next Prime Minister, Jean Chrétien, approved its expansion – the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA – 1994). The continental integration of North America came true.

Canada's contemporary political scene, in spite of preserving some conservative rules and tendencies, is definitely less hostile against the United States. This is certainly connected with the growing Americanization of English-speaking Canada, which has been eliminating all connections with Great Britain. The diminishing authority of the Roman Catholic Church in the French-speaking part of Canada is also important.<sup>30</sup> The great discussion that took place in Canadian society in 1988 concerning the alleged greater dependence on the United States, particularly in the areas of culture, administration, internal issues and environmental protection, has

---

<sup>27</sup> A. Reczyńska, *U.S.A. and Canada. The basic differences in the historical process*, in: *Visions of Canadian Studies: Teaching, research, methodology*, ed. N. Burke, J. Kwatarko, Warsaw: Warsaw University 2000, p. 36.

<sup>28</sup> R. Mathews, *op.cit.*

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>30</sup> *Canada-U.S. Relations...*, *op.cit.*

ended. In 2002, *Pollara*, in its public opinion poll for the Liberal Party, recorded that 66% of citizens were in support of an even greater tightening of economic ties with the U.S.<sup>31</sup> Only 5% of them opposed such an idea.<sup>32</sup> In this context it is interesting to mention the results of other surveys published by *Leger* in August 2001.<sup>33</sup> They provide a picture of how Canadians view Canadian-American relations. Almost 89% of the entire Canadian population believes that these relations are good.<sup>34</sup> But, on the other hand, Canadians express a negative opinion of the NAFTA free trade treaty – only 8.5% of them believe that their state has benefited from its ratification, and as many as 53% are of the opinion that its greatest beneficiary is the U.S.<sup>35</sup> One should note that over 80% of Canadians believe that the standard of living in their country is higher than in the U.S., almost 75% that the country has a better standard of education, 63% that it possesses a better system of justice, and 62.3% that it has a better political system.<sup>36</sup>

In the opinion of Jonathan Gatehouse and William Lowther, authors of the article *America Lite: Is That Our Future?*, published in the November issue of *Maclean's* weekly<sup>37</sup>, changes in the attitudes of Canadians do not only refer to economic issues.

"Canadians remain patriotic and intensely protective of our national symbols (...) but are less and less worried about the dangers they used to see in getting close to our neighbour. The things that once distinguished us – a belief in a more activist government, support for cultural protectionism – have ebbed away."<sup>38</sup>

## NORTH AMERICAN DESTINY

The Americanization of Canada's culture and politics and the growing economic integration reduce the number of points of reference which Canadians used to resort to demonstrate the difference of their political culture. The *Maclean's* issue of November 2002, devoted to Canadian-American relations,<sup>39</sup> quotes Michael Marzolini, head of *Pollara*, the afore-mentioned public opinion poll company. He says that Canadian now society expresses less fear of the United States, and at the same time adds: "The differences [between Canada and the U.S.] are becoming less distinct. (...) When we put people in focus groups they wrap the flag around two things – gun control and health care."<sup>40</sup>

The essay entitled *Canada-U.S. Relations*<sup>41</sup> proposes a different view on the issue of Canadian self-identification. The authors attempt to define it both negatively (we are not Americans) and positively (our government cares about the issues that yours

<sup>31</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.

<sup>32</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>33</sup> *A Study of How Canadians Perceive Canada-U.S. Relations: Executive Report*, Leger Marketing 2001, <http://www.legermarketing.com/documents/spclm/010910eng.pdf>, (24 XI 2002).

<sup>34</sup> Ibidem, p. 5.

<sup>35</sup> Ibidem, p. 5.

<sup>36</sup> Ibidem, p. 3.

<sup>37</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>39</sup> "Maclean's", 25/11/2002.

<sup>40</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.

<sup>41</sup> *Canada-U.S. Relations...*, op.cit.



ignores), and stress the bilingual and bicultural (in fact multi-cultural) character of the state.<sup>42</sup> Nonetheless, it seems that this approach to national identification may reach a dead center – I am Canadian because our government ensures free health care (Medicare), and the American one does not. One should not forget, however, that during 135 years of its sovereignty Canada has obviously developed a special approach to many public issues, such as foreign policy. It was based on negotiations and peaceful conflict solving. This was particularly noticeable during the “golden era of diplomacy”, crowned with the Nobel Peace Prize awarded in 1957 to Lester Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs. We can also find a unique Canadian approach in management. *Crown corporations*, e.g. Petro-Canada, even though have recently been transformed towards free market, still distinguishes Canada from the United States.

In his book entitled *Yankee Go Home: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*, published in the mid-1990s, Jack Granatstein wrote that anti-Americanism in Canada had reached its historical bottom.<sup>43</sup> Hatred towards Americans is improper at official meetings. It is seen as a form of envy resulting from slower economic development and less power. For Granatstein, the signing of the NAFTA treaty was the end of anti-Americanism. This view is shared by a political scientist from the University of Toronto, Stephen Clarkson, who writes that the type of nationalism that flourished in Canada in the 1960s and 1970s is already dead now.<sup>44</sup>

However, this does not mean that Canadians are no longer cautious. Many of them are still sceptical about profits associated with free trade. They are irritated by the lack of American sensitivity to Canadians' fears of compromising their culture. The most important statement resulting from Granatstein's thesis is that the separation of Canada from the United States has presently become completely impractical. According to Granatstein, Canada has finally approved its North American destiny.<sup>45</sup>

However, this is not so obvious. When we monitor Canada's behavior after the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, its ambivalence is clearly visible. When President Bush declared war against terrorists, Canadian leaders were not willing to support their neighbor without reservations. Some time elapsed before the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Elinor Caplan, finally agreed to tighter checks; the Minister of Defence, Art Eggleton, declared that the Canadian army would be sent to Afghanistan if there were no threats for the soldiers, and Prime Minister Chrétien believed that the immediate consent to U.S. requests would mean loss of Canada's sovereignty.<sup>46</sup> As a result, Americans placed Canada in the second row of allies in building the war coalition. During his speech in Congress on September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2001, President Bush did not mention Canada among the countries he was thanking for

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>43</sup> J. Granatstein, op.cit.

<sup>44</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.

<sup>45</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>46</sup> J. Ibbitson, *Manley's manoeuvres keep Canada in line to join U.S. 'club'*, “The Globe and Mail”, Jan. 16, 2002, p. A4, <http://www.globeandmail.com/servlet/ArticleNews/printarticle/gam/20020116/UWASHN>, (24 XI 2002).

help.<sup>47</sup> In addition, more stringent border procedures on the American side posed a threat to the flow of goods between the neighbors, which was of critical importance to Canada, bearing in mind the afore-mentioned structure of its economy.

In January 2002 John Manley was appointed Deputy Prime Minister. The assignment of the former Minister of Foreign Affairs was to rebuild good relations between the neighbors. Manley is regarded as an advocate of very close Canada-U.S. ties. He deserves credit for the Parliament's adoption of anti-terrorist laws. He was also appointed head of the cabinet committee on public security. All of Canada's federal laws, from immigration and banking laws to defence and intelligence, were harmonized with respective U.S. laws.<sup>48</sup> The same was done with visa requirements. Canada sent their army to Afghanistan as well.

The greater integration of Canada and the United States is an issue that is no longer a taboo subject. Members of the Liberal Party include advocates of tight co-operation and law harmonization in many domains, from defence to customs procedures.<sup>49</sup> One of them is Maurizio Bevilacqua, Chair of the Standing Committee on Finance in the Canadian House of Commons, which developed a comprehensive report in 2001 – a revision of economic relations with the U.S. The wing of the Liberal Party that aims at closer integration with the U.S. is also represented by Bill Graham, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada. He is an advocate of NAFTA expansion to social and environmental issues as well as jurisdiction. He believes that North American integration should be much deeper and not limited only to the elimination of duties and trade barriers.<sup>50</sup>

On the other hand, there is strong opposition to such an approach in Canada. Many views stress the need to defend Canada's sovereignty. An example is Mel Hurtig, author of the book entitled *The Vanishing Country*. He conventionally refers to the Canadian economy, in which 35 sectors are controlled by foreign capital (mostly from the U.S.). Such a situation does not appear in the southern neighbor at all.<sup>51</sup> Such a critical approach is also represented by the NDP (New Democratic Party), whose former leader, Alexa McDonough, accuses Liberals of 'selling' Canada's sovereignty. She commented upon Manley's nomination for Deputy Prime Minister in the following way: "In a sense, Manley's elevation to this key set of responsibilities simply confirms the Liberal vision of Canada as the 51<sup>st</sup> state."<sup>52</sup> Similarly, not all members of the ruling party (left wing) support the idea of close ties with the U.S.

It seems that the situation depicted above reflects the attitude of all of Canadian society to the issue of deeper ties with the U.S. Canada's historical conditions as well as the traditional distrust towards its southern neighbor cause this issue to be treated with extreme caution. According to polls, Canadians support greater integration,

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>48</sup> A. Martin, *The Chrétien Legacy: Canada-U.S. harmonization...*, "Politics Watch", 2002, [http://politicswatch.com/canada-us\\_relations.htm](http://politicswatch.com/canada-us_relations.htm), (24 XI 2002).

<sup>49</sup> S. Delacourt, *Putting the brakes on Americanization*, "The Ottawa Citizen", Nov. 27, 2001, <http://www.pollara.ca/new/LIBRARY/SURVEYS/americanization.htm>, (27 XI 2002).

<sup>50</sup> R. Fife, *66% favour stronger ties to U.S.* "National Post", October 21, 2002, <http://www.pollara.ca/new/Library/SURVEYS/strongertiesus.htm>, (28 XI 2002).

<sup>51</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.

<sup>52</sup> J. Ibbitson, op.cit.

even in social issues and culture, but only on their own terms, and provided that Canadian values are respected.<sup>53</sup> Opposition regards the slogan of the Americanization of Canada as the 'passkey' that automatically releases defensive functions of the society. A similar response is only induced by attempts to abolish the monarchy – which is still regarded as the foundation of the state.<sup>54</sup> Sociological research proves this thesis. Extreme opinions of the left wing of the Liberal Party, NDP members, or nationalists similar to Maude Barlow from the Council of Canadians, are not supported within the society.<sup>55</sup>

Some authors believe that the growth of integration and cooperation between the neighbors would continue after September 11<sup>th</sup>, even if these tragic events had not happened. Laura McDonald, director of the Centre on North American Politics and Society at Carleton University, says that "Sept. 11<sup>th</sup> didn't create it, it's just speeded up the process. In that sense, Sept. 11<sup>th</sup> acted as a wake up call to us."<sup>56</sup> This mainly applies to the harmonization of safety and immigration laws. In this context, it is important to ask if this coordination has occurred because the United States desired it, or whether Canada has fostered the process in pursuit of its own interests and has taken relevant steps as an entirely independent state. A threat is the lack of social consultations before these steps were taken.

Certainly there are some issues in the relations between the two countries that each of them sees from a completely different perspective. The discrepancy between opinions can be observed in such acts as 'racial profiling' – treatment of people of Arabic origin with much greater caution on the American border, and doing things such as taking their fingerprints. But understanding of U.S. policies has also been voiced. In *The Globe and Mail* issue of November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2002, John Ibbitson wrote in an editorial: "Canadians want Americans to treat us as their closest friends, the exception to all of their rules. Except we reserve the right to treat them the way everyone else treats them. We criticize their culture, mock their government, lambaste their foreign policy, decry their economic success. Then we react with horror when they apply the same regulation to us that they apply to everyone else, even to allies far more stalwart than ourselves."<sup>57</sup> Other controversial issues are the establishment of the International Criminal Court and ratification of the Kyoto Agreement. In the afore mentioned interview for "Maclean's", John Manley stated: "There are some times we have good reasons to disagree with the United States and go a different way. Ratification of Kyoto is a recent example of our going on a different course. On the other hand, we're not an island in the Pacific Ocean. We're on the North American continent."<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> S. Delacourt, op.cit.

<sup>54</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>55</sup> R. Fife, op.cit.

<sup>56</sup> A. Martin, op.cit.

<sup>57</sup> J. Ibbitson, *U.S. rules apply to us too*, "The Globe and Mail", Nov. 2, 2002, p. A19, [http://www.globeandmail.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/PEstory/TGAM/20021102/COIBBI2/national/national/nationalColumnistsHeadline\\_temp/4/4/13, \(24 XI 2002\).](http://www.globeandmail.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/PEstory/TGAM/20021102/COIBBI2/national/national/nationalColumnistsHeadline_temp/4/4/13, (24 XI 2002).)

<sup>58</sup> J. Manley, *We should be a little more grown-up*, Q&A, "Maclean's", 2002, Vol. 115, No. 37, p. 39.

One should pose the question whether present reality allows us to consider creating something like the European Union on the North American continent, or not. According to Laura McDonald, it is much too early to formulate such ideas.<sup>59</sup> One should rather expect even tighter economic ties. Government circles are not considering any political union. In spite of discussions concerning the introduction of a common currency, this issue still remains a purely theoretical one. Research proves that only 40% of the Canadian population supports the introduction of a common currency (55% is opposed).<sup>60</sup> Perhaps this results from the fear that the common currency will be the U.S. dollar. The attitude towards tighter cultural relations is completely different. According to surveys conducted by *Pollara*, fears of losing cultural sovereignty are not as strong in the society as demonstrated by the aforementioned politicians or journalists.<sup>61</sup>

In his book entitled *Canadian Foreign Policy*,<sup>62</sup> J.L. Granatstein, a Canadian historian, notices that the new generation of political scientists and historians views the history of Canada as a process of moving from a colony, through a state, to a colony again. They suggest that Canada has passed from being a colony of the British Empire to being a vassal of the United States, with a short period of independence in-between. It does not seem that this opinion is correct in the context of the events that have occurred at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Canada is rather becoming a more mature state that is able to take advantage of its powerful neighbor's proximity. Marjorie LeBreton, senator of the Conservative Party and former associate of Brian Mulroney, believes that the changes in the cooperation with Americans confirm the rationale for the free trade treaties. "I'm pleased to hear that Canadians are starting to break out of their 'little Canada' attitude and I have always been puzzled why some Canadians have an inferiority complex (...) Mr. Mulroney was courageous in pushing for free trade and NAFTA and Canadians now overwhelmingly support that."<sup>63</sup>

The events of 2001 have surely affected Canadian-American relations. They have forced the countries to rethink the significance of their common border. The process towards full integration, if this goal is ever reached, will not be spectacularly rapid. It is beyond doubt that it will take many years. There are too many historical burdens making the agreement difficult, and there are too many issues that are differently perceived in each of the countries. The public debates that took place during the negotiations in 1988 and 1994 will begin again. However, the most important issue is to fight the Canadian inferiority complex, which has made contacts difficult in the past. This was confirmed by John Manley in one of his interviews: "I think we as Canadians have sometimes been a little bit immature in the way we've dealt with the United States. We tend to be hypersensitive and we actually behave like a junior partner. We should be a little more grown-up about it and behave like an equal partner."<sup>64</sup>

It seems that Canadians are on the right path to reaching this goal. The prevailing opinion among Canadian diplomats and decision-makers is that the present relations

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>60</sup> *A Study of How Canadians Perceive Canada-U.S. Relations...*, op.cit.

<sup>61</sup> R. Fife, op.cit.

<sup>62</sup> J.L. Granatstein, ed., *Canadian ...*, p. VI.

<sup>63</sup> R. Fife, op.cit.

<sup>64</sup> J. Manley, op.cit.

between the neighbors are as good as can be between a Liberal prime minister and a Republican president.<sup>65</sup> This does not change the fact that it still makes sense to try to understand Canada by comparing it with the United States. The question of whether Canada will ever decide to lift the border with the U.S., as European Union member countries did, still remains unanswered. Another question is whether Canadians have already become a nation that is mature enough to base its identity on borders that are of a cultural nature only.

## REFERENCES:

- A Study of How Canadians Perceive Canada-U.S. Relations: Executive Report*, Leger Marketing, 2001, <http://www.legermarketing.com/documents/spclm/010910eng.pdf>.
- Camp D., *In Uncle Sam's Shadow*, "Maclean's", 12/16/96, Vol. 109, Issue 51.
- Canada-U.S. Relations: The Road Not Taken*, in: Hillwatch.com: The Politics and Public Policy Resource Centre, [http://www.hillwatch.com/publications/intl\\_tradecan-us.htm](http://www.hillwatch.com/publications/intl_tradecan-us.htm).
- Chapnic A., *Inevitable Co-Dependency (And Things Best Left Unsaid): The Grandy Report on Canadian-American Relations, 1951-?*, "Canadian Foreign Policy", Vol. 9, No. 1, Fall 2001.
- Chrétien R., *Canada-U.S. Relations @ 2000: A Success Story*, in: Canadian Embassy, 1999, <http://www.canadianembassy.org/ambassador/991027-en.asp>.
- CIA World Factbook 2002*, 2002, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/us.html#Econ>.
- Delacourt S., *Putting the brakes on Americanization*, "The Ottawa Citizen", Nov. 27, 2001, <http://www.pollara.ca/new/LIBRARY/SURVEYS/americanization.htm>.
- Dobrzycki W., *System międzyamerykański*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Scholar 2002.
- Fife R., *66% favour stronger ties to U.S.*, "National Post", October 21, 2002, <http://www.pollara.ca/new/Library/SURVEYS/strongertiesus.htm>.
- Gatehouse J., Lowther W., *America Lite: Is That Our Future?*, "Maclean's", 25/11/2002, [http://www.macleans.ca/xta-asp/storyview.asp?viewtype=search&tpl=search\\_frame&edate=2002/11/25&vpath=/xta-doc1/2002/11/25/cover/75850.shtml&maxrec=3&recnum=2&searchtype=BASIC&pg=1&ranibase=108&searchstring=America+Lite](http://www.macleans.ca/xta-asp/storyview.asp?viewtype=search&tpl=search_frame&edate=2002/11/25&vpath=/xta-doc1/2002/11/25/cover/75850.shtml&maxrec=3&recnum=2&searchtype=BASIC&pg=1&ranibase=108&searchstring=America+Lite).
- Granatstein J.L., ed., *Canadian Foreign Policy: Historical Readings*, Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd. 1993.
- Ibbittson J., *U.S. rules apply to us too*, "The Globe and Mail", Nov. 2, 2002, [http://www.globeandmail.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/PEstory/TGAM/20021102/COIBBI2/national/national/nationalColumnistsHeadline\\_temp/4/4/13](http://www.globeandmail.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/PEstory/TGAM/20021102/COIBBI2/national/national/nationalColumnistsHeadline_temp/4/4/13).
- Mahant E.E., G. S. Mount, *An Introduction to Canadian-American Relations*, Agincourt, Ontario: Methuen Publications 1994.
- Manley J., *We should be a little more grown-up*, Q&A, "Maclean's", 2002, Vol. 115, No. 37.
- Martin A., *The Chrétien Legacy: Canada-U.S. harmonization...*, "Politics Watch", 2002, [http://politicswatch.com/canada-us\\_relations.htm](http://politicswatch.com/canada-us_relations.htm).
- Mathews R., *Canada/U.S. Relations*, in: Canadian Foundations, 1996, <http://www.ola.bc.ca/online/cf/module-4/usrel.html>.
- Reczyńska A., *U.S.A. and Canada. The basic differences in the historical process*, in: Visions of Canadian Studies: Teaching, research, methodology, ed. N. Burke, J. Kwaterko, Warsaw: Warsaw University 2000.
- Thompson J.H., Randall S.J., *Canada and the United States. Ambivalent Allies*, Athens, Georgia and London: The University of Georgia Press 1994.

<sup>65</sup> J. Gatehouse, W. Lowther, op.cit.